

Appln No. 09/693,415
Amdt. Dated April 13, 2005
Response to Office Action of March 18, 2005

4

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Office Action dated March 18, 2005.

Amendments

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to specify a method and a system for delivering a document directly to a user on demand. Basis for this amendment can be found on page 5, lines 22-28 of the description.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Applicant contests the Examiner's assertion claim 1 is obvious in view of Dymetman (US 6,330,976) when combined with Ur (6,072,871) and Markowitz (US 5,513,254).

Dymetman discusses a system by which printed information can be enhanced using coded substrates. Dymetman's enhancement of documents allows users to access further information relating to particular features contained in these documents. However, Dymetman is very specific as to how such documents should be produced and this is explained in detail at column 11, lines 55-65 of Dymetman:

A coded substrate supplier could produce sheets of paper in different formats for different uses by the publishing industry. Each sheet can be processed through a specialized printing procedure which (1) assigns a fresh page-identifier (and possibly page-id-code) to the sheet, and (2) prints in UV ink machine-readable markings encoding the page-identifier (and possibly page-id-code) on the surface of the sheet.

A publisher can buy these apparently uniformly white sheets and can print visible markings on them using standard ink.

What is clear from this passage and the overall teaching of the Dymetman article is that **Dymetman does not envisage documents being delivered to consumers any differently to how they are currently delivered.** Dymetman's system relates to documents that are

Appln No. 09/693,415
Amdt. Dated April 13, 2005
Response to Office Action of March 18, 2005

5

mass-produced at a commercial printer's, and then purchased from a newsagent or delivered through the post to the consumer.

Hence, it is abundantly clear that **Dymetman does not conceive of users receiving interactive documents directly via a home printer**. According to Dymetman's system a user obtains documents in the usual way, but has the additional option at home of requesting further information about a particular article.

By contrast, the present invention goes further than merely enhancing the information content of documents. The present inventors have conceived of a new method by which a user can obtain documents, which are interactive. The presently claimed method combines all the advantages of online publications with a printed format. In contrast, Dymetman fails to utilize all the advantages of online publications, which are regularly updated in real-time. Dymetman's system cannot deliver documents to users that are "current" at any given time.

A requirement of the Applicant's new method for delivering interactive documents directly to users' printers on demand is that coded data and document information should be printed at the same time at the user's printer. The system would be unworkable if the coded data was printed separately from the information content, because the interactive periodicals could not be printed on demand.

The Examiner has cited Ur in support of his argument that it would be obvious to print coded data and document information at the same time. However, it is submitted that the skilled person would not turn to Ur, having read the disclosure of Dymetman. Dymetman improves the information content of documents but makes no mention of changing the way in which documents can be delivered to end-users. Furthermore, even if the skilled person were to turn to Ur, he would find that this document falls short of suggesting the Applicant's system of delivering interactive documents directly to users on demand.

In summary, it is a significant development in the art to combine all the advantages of printed publications with online publications and neither Dymetman nor Ur teach a system capable of doing this.

App'n No. 09/693,415
Amdt. Dated April 13, 2005
Response to Office Action of March 18, 2005

6

For these reasons, it is submitted that the present invention, as defined in claims 1 and 9, is not obvious in view of any of the cited documents.

It is submitted that all the Examiner's objections have been traversed. Reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

Applicant:



PAUL LAPSTUN

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762